

In 1983, TELACU established the LINC TELACU Education Foundation. For 23 years, the foundation has partnered with corporate donors, private individuals, and a vast network of colleges and universities, providing the driving force behind one of the most effective national institutions ever to impact the educational needs of the Latino community.

In conceiving the foundation, TELACU discovered that while financial assistance is vital for college students to achieve academic success, other factors are also important. Students who are the first in their families ever to attend college often lack the support system necessary to achieve their dream. Socio-economic factors, family responsibilities, cultural identity and financial stress create very real conflicting challenges to academic life.

The LINC TELACU Education Foundation has accepted this challenge head on, combining important financial assistance with highly effective programs that ensure college completion. The foundation supports 600 college students and serves 2,000 elementary, middle and high school students and veterans each year. The success of this extraordinary foundation is best summarized by the numbers: Its scholar retention and college graduation rates are an astounding 100 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I join today with community leaders throughout my State in expressing our Nation's gratitude to TELACU and the LINC TELACU Education Foundation for believing in the dream of higher education for America's next generation of pioneers and helping to make it possible.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEPHANIE HERSETH

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2006

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, on May 22, 2006, I missed rollcall vote No. 177 on S. 1235, the Veterans Benefits Improvement Act, and rollcall vote No. 178 on H.R. 3858, the Pets Evacuation and Transportation Standards Act. I was unable to vote because I was participating in a House Agriculture Subcommittee field hearing and post-hearing meetings with automobile industry executives in Rochester, MI, on the role that industry can play in promoting renewable energy technology in the United States. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea" on S. 1235 and "yea" on H.R. 3858.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2006

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 173: On ordering the previous question. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 174: On agreeing to H. Res. 821, the rule providing for consideration H.R. 5385. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 175: On the Blumenauer amendment to

H.R. 5385. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 176: On final passage of H.R. 5385. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2006

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 168, the Chabot-Andrews amendment to the Interior and Environment Appropriations, though I intended to vote aye, I accidentally voted nay. The Chabot-Andrews amendment would prohibit the Forest Service from building more roads for private timber in the Tongass National Forest in Alaska. The timber program in the Tongass costs taxpayers approximately \$40 million each year. I have long been a supporter of reforming the road building program in the Tongass, and have supported this amendment in the past. I am pleased that the amendment ultimately passed, and I sincerely regret that I accidentally voted against it.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2006

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 22, 2006, I was unable to be present, to vote on the motions to suspend the rules and pass as amended S. 1235 the Veterans Benefits Improvement Act (rollcall No. 177) and H.R. 3858, the Pets Evacuation and Transportation Standards Act (rollcall No. 178). Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both measures.

COAL-TO-LIQUIDS TRANSPORTATION FUELS

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2006

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, for decades this Nation has been researching, debating, drafting, and redrafting national energy policy. Unfortunately, the long gas lines of the 1970's that motivated the kind of original thought needed to end our dependency on foreign oil slipped from our memories as supplies increased and prices dropped. Today, we are punished with oil prices floating in the range of \$75 a barrel, record prices at the pump, and an unstable world market for the foreseeable future.

At the same time, according to the Department of Energy, \$35-\$45 a barrel oil is attainable from a source within our borders. It is our most abundant domestic energy resource—coal. With technology that has been around for decades, coal can be liquefied and turned into a liquid fuel, and eventually sold for approximately half of what we are paying now per barrel.

The true value of coal is misunderstood and many ignore its potential to free us from foreign oil at our own peril. We risk stepping into the same trap that has caught so many promising energy policy advances by the ankle for decades.

Research has brought us a long, long way from the days of smokestacks and gray skies. True, there remain many less efficient, older generation power plants in this Nation, but largely because, while the Government draped oil companies in rich tax advantages, it devoted mere dribbles of money to providing incentives for clean burning coal plants.

Thirty years of government and private-sector research and development has created a product, according to the Department of Energy, that is cleaner than required under EPA Tier II fuel standards. And with this Nation's refinery capacity operating on all cylinders, these fuels would fit right into our energy mix as they would require very little additional processing. Coal-to-liquids can curb our appetite for foreign fuel.

Dsturbingly, however, for all of our Nation's pride in our competitiveness and innovation, we stand behind a number of other countries in liquefying coal to end our foreign oil dependence.

For instance, these fuels represent about one-third of the consumption in South Africa, which began its production and use in the 1950's using the Fischer-Tropsch process developed during the 1920's by two German researchers. China, India, and Indonesia, recognizing the problems of relying on foreign sources of oil, are all aggressively pursuing coal liquefaction as key components of their energy production. For the U.S., our continued myopia about coal liquefaction is particularly numb-headed, since coal is our most abundant natural energy resource.

In order to catch up to the rest of the world, a position to which the U.S. is unaccustomed, we must invest in our future and Congress began to travel down this road with the reauthorization of the Nation's surface transportation laws last year by including two new excise tax credits aimed at promoting the use of alternative transportation fuels, including liquid fuel derived from coal.

While a helpful first step, due to the restrictive nature of the existing tax credit, I am pleased to join my colleague JOHN SHIMKUS and others in introducing legislation aimed at helping far-sighted firms better afford their foray into coal liquefaction. Our bill would reduce some of the risk that these firms and their investors take as they try to lead our Nation into a new energy frontier.

Simply put, our legislation would extend until 2020 the 50 cents per gallon tax credit for liquid fuel derived from coal that is set to expire in 2009. The legislation does not address other alternative transportation fuels, just coal-to-liquids.

The aim is to provide a level of predictability for a number of years to those willing to put money into coal-to-liquids production. It would help to smooth out some of the ups and downs associated with fluctuating oil prices and the gamble investors make in the financing of these high-tech energy ventures.

Unfortunately, while other governments have been footing the bill for this kind of research and development for decades, our Government has been "playing footsie" with Big Oil. In comparison to the big tax giveaways enjoyed by the oil industry, precious